IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE SIDE

WRIT PETITION NO. 3879 OF 2004

Mrs. Renuka Manish Mhaselkar.... Petitioner

versus

Mr. Savari Muthu Arunachalam & ors.... Respondent.

Mr. M.S. Menon for the petitioner.
Mr. J.S.Kini i/b Suresh Dubey for the respondent no/..

CORAM; A.P. DESHPANDE, J.
DATED; 21ST SEPTEMBER, 2007

P.C.;

1. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. Taken up for final hearing by consent of parties.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner does not press the proposed amendment contained in para 10(a), 10(b), 10(c), 10(d), 10(e), and 10(g) of the schedule pn page 23. The challenge to the impugned order which goes to reject the proposed amendment touching he above paragraphs is given up. The learned counsel for the respondent does not oppose the petition to the extent it seeks amendment in terms of paragraph 10(f) and prayer clause b(ii). The learned counsel for the petitioner does not press the other prayer clauses. On a concession made by the learned counsel for the respondent, the impugned order to the extent it

rejects the proposed amendment for insertion of para 10(f) and prayer clause b(ii) is quashed and set aside. The proposed amendment prayed by the petitioner for inserting para 10(f) and prayer clause b(ii) is allowed. Writ Petition is thus disposed of. Rule made absolute in the above terms.

....